



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,896	07/25/2003	Hassan Mahini	2002-014	4007
54472	7590	07/17/2008		
COATS & BENNETT/SONY ERICSSON			EXAMINER	
1400 CRESCENT GREEN			BALAOING, ARIEL A	
SUITE 300				
CARY, NC 27511			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/627,896	MAHINI, HASSAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ARIEL BALAOING	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4-10,13-19,22-28 and 35 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,4-10,13-19,22-28 and 35 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1,10, 19, 28, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by QU et al (US 2004/0203651 A1).

Regarding claim 1, QU discloses a method of accessing functions of a mobile communication device **100** (abstract) comprising: generating a consolidated event list [**displayed annunciators**] to consolidate events according to event type, the consolidated event list comprising one or more event items, with each event item corresponding to a different event type (paragraph 10-12); dynamically updating the consolidated event list by adding an event item when a new event occurs and the consolidated event list does not already have an event item corresponding to the same event type (Table 2; paragraph 28, 29); automatically deleting an event item when a user has responded to all events corresponding to the event item (paragraph 12, 31, 40); displaying the consolidated event list to a user on a display (Figures 1 and 2); associating a menu item in a hierarchical menu with each event item in the consolidated event list (paragraph 27); and invoking the associated menu item in said hierarchical

menu responsive to selection of an event item from the consolidated event list by the user (paragraph 62, 64).

Regarding claim 10, QU discloses a mobile communication device **100** comprising: a display **110** for displaying menu items in a hierarchical menu for selection by a user (Figures 1 and 2); a memory **530** for storing a consolidated event list that consolidates events according to event type, the consolidated event list comprising one or more event items, with each event item corresponding to a different event type (paragraph 10-12); and a processor **526** configured to: dynamically update said consolidated event list by adding an event item **[annunciator]** to said consolidated event list when a new designated event occurs and the consolidated event list does not already have an event item corresponding to the same event type (Table 2; paragraph 28, 29); and automatically deleting an event item from said consolidated event list when a user has responded to all events corresponding to the event item (paragraph 12, 31, 40); display said consolidated event list on a display for viewing by a user (Figures 1 and 2); associate a menu item in a hierarchical menu with each event item in said consolidated event list (paragraph 27); and invoke the associated menu item in said hierarchical menu responsive to selection of an event item from the consolidated event list by the user (paragraph 62, 64).

Regarding claim 19, QU discloses a circuit **100x** for controlling a user interface including a display **110**, said circuit comprising a processor **526** programmed to: generate a consolidated event list **[displayed annunciators]** to consolidate events according to event type, the consolidated event list comprising one or more event items,

with each event item corresponding to a different event type (paragraph 10-12); dynamically update the consolidated event list by adding an event item when a new event occurs and the consolidated event list does not already have an event item corresponding to the same event type (Table 2; paragraph 28, 29); deleting an event item when a user has responded to all events corresponding to the event item (paragraph 12, 31, 40); display the consolidated event list to a user on a display (Figures 1 and 2); associate a menu item in a hierarchical menu with each event item in the consolidated event list (paragraph 27); and invoke the associated menu item in said hierarchical menu responsive to selection of an event item from the consolidated event list by the user (paragraph 62, 64).

Regarding claim 28, QU discloses a computer readable medium having logic stored thereon, the logic configured to control a user interface in a mobile communication device, and to control said mobile communication device to: generate a consolidated event list [**displayed annunciators**] to consolidate events according to event type, the consolidated event list comprising one or more event items, with each event item corresponding to a different event type (paragraph 10-12); dynamically update the consolidated event list by adding an event item when a new event occurs and the consolidated event list does not already have an event item corresponding to the same event type (Table 2; paragraph 28, 29); automatically deleting an event item when a user has responded to all events corresponding to the event item (paragraph 12, 31, 40); display the consolidated event list to a user on a display (Figures 1 and 2); associate a menu item in a hierarchical menu with each event item in the consolidated

event list (paragraph 27); and invoke the associated menu item in said hierarchical menu responsive to selection of an event item from the consolidated event list by the user (paragraph 62, 64).

Regarding claim 35, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. QU further discloses wherein dynamically updating the consolidated event list further comprises determining a type for the new event, and adding the event item to the consolidated list if the type of new event has not been excluded by the user (paragraph 12, 28, 56-58; QU discloses the ability to activate and deactivate certain functions of the annunciator. Furthermore while QU discloses that any of the items on Table 2 may be used, in the examples provide by QU, none of the applications shown have been excluded).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 4-7, 13-16, 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over QU et al (US 2004/0203651 A1) in view of KRAFT (6,381,474 B1).

Regarding claim 4, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Although QU discloses the use of shortcut commands, QU does not expressly disclose wherein said consolidated event list is displayed responsive to entry of a shortcut command by said user. In a similar field of endeavor, KRAFT discloses wherein a consolidated event list is displayed responsive to entry of a shortcut command by said user (abstract; Figure 3; col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line

8; col. 4, line 50-57; col. 7, line 44-51). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify QU to include the teachings of KRAFT, since displaying a list responsive to a user command allows control of a display based on a users input. Furthermore, display of various lists through a shortcut is well known and conventional in the art and allows various menus and submenus to be accessed according to a programmed interface.

Regarding claim 5, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, QU does not expressly disclose further comprising sorting said consolidated event list before said consolidated event list is displayed. In the same field of endeavor, KRAFT discloses sorting a consolidated event list before said consolidated event list is displayed (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify QU to include the teachings of KRAFT, since such a modification provides a listing of most relevant events based on a user defined priority. Furthermore, the use of a sorted list is well known and conventional in the art that provides data sets according to a defined rule.

Regarding claim 6, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of QU and KRAFT further discloses wherein said consolidated event list is sorted in time order (KRAFT - col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

Regarding claim 7, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of QU and KRAFT further

discloses wherein said consolidated event list is sorted based on priorities assigned to said consolidated events on said consolidated event list (KRAFT - col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

Regarding claim 13, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Although QU discloses the use of shortcut commands, QU does not expressly disclose wherein the processor displays said consolidated event list responsive to entry of a shortcut command by said user. In a similar field of endeavor, KRAFT discloses wherein a consolidated event list is displayed responsive to entry of a shortcut command by said user (abstract; Figure 3; col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 8; col. 4, line 50-57; col. 7, line 44-51). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify QU to include the teachings of KRAFT, since displaying a list responsive to a user command allows control of a display based on a users input. Furthermore, display of various lists through a shortcut is well known and conventional in the art and allows various menus and submenus to be accessed according to a programmed interface.

Regarding claim 14, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, QU does not expressly disclose wherein the processor sorts said consolidated event list before said consolidated event list is displayed. In the same field of endeavor, KRAFT discloses sorting a consolidated event list before said consolidated event list is displayed (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify QU to include the teachings of KRAFT, since such a

modification provides a listing of most relevant events based on a user defined priority. Furthermore, the use of a sorted list is well known and conventional in the art that provides data sets according to a defined rule.

Regarding claim 15, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of QU and KRAFT further discloses wherein said processor sorts said consolidated event list is in time order (KRAFT - col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

Regarding claim 16, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of QU and KRAFT further discloses wherein said processor sorts said consolidated event list based on priorities assigned to said consolidated events on said consolidated event list (KRAFT - col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

Regarding claim 22, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Although QU discloses the use of shortcut commands, QU does not expressly disclose wherein the processor displays said consolidated event list responsive to entry of a shortcut command by said user. In a similar field of endeavor, KRAFT discloses wherein a consolidated event list is displayed responsive to entry of a shortcut command by said user (abstract; Figure 3; col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 8; col. 4, line 50-57; col. 7, line 44-51). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify QU to include the teachings of KRAFT, since displaying a list responsive to a user command allows control of a display based on a users input. Furthermore, display

of various lists through a shortcut is well known and conventional in the art and allows various menus and submenus to be accessed according to a programmed interface.

Regarding claim 23, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, QU does not expressly disclose wherein the processor sorts said consolidated event list before said consolidated event list is displayed. In the same field of endeavor, KRAFT discloses sorting a consolidated event list before said consolidated event list is displayed (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify QU to include the teachings of KRAFT, since such a modification provides a listing of most relevant events based on a user defined priority. Furthermore, the use of a sorted list is well known and conventional in the art that provides data sets according to a defined rule.

Regarding claim 24, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of QU and KRAFT further discloses wherein said processor sorts said consolidated event list is in time order (KRAFT - col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

Regarding claim 25, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of QU and KRAFT further discloses wherein said processor sorts said consolidated event list based on priorities assigned to said consolidated events on said consolidated event list (KRAFT - col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

5. Claims 8, 9, 17, 18, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over QU et al (US 2004/0203651 A1) in view of KRAFT (6,381,474 B1) and further in view of ROTH (US 6,266,060 B1).

Regarding claim 8, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependant upon. Although KRAFT discloses using priority sorting (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64), the combination of QU and KRAFT does not expressly disclose wherein said priorities are assigned to said events items on said consolidated event list by the user. ROTH discloses wherein said priorities are assigned to said events items on said consolidated event list by the user (column 13, line 21-column 14, line 33). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of QU and KRAFT to include the menu sorting abilities described in ROTH as both disclose a way to prioritize menu rankings. As stated by ROTH, *it should be understood that the present invention can be used to arrange any menu of user-selectable items regardless of the medium that is used to present the menu* (column 5, lines 30-38, column 5, lines 46-59, column 6, lines 31-42). This is beneficial in that it allows for various sorting techniques in any menu environment of user-selectable items.

Regarding claim 9, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependant upon. The combination of QU, KRAFT, and ROTH further discloses wherein said consolidated event list is sorted based on usage statistics associated with said events items on said consolidated event list (ROTH - column 13, line 21-column 14, line 33).

Regarding claim 17 and 26, see the rejections of the parent claims concerning the subject matter these claims are dependant upon. Although KRAFT discloses using priority sorting (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64), the combination of QU and KRAFT does not expressly disclose wherein said priorities are assigned to said events items on said consolidated event list by the user. ROTH discloses wherein said priorities are assigned to said events items on said consolidated event list by a user (column 13, line 21-column 14, line 33). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of QU and KRAFT to include the menu sorting abilities described in ROTH as both disclose a way to prioritize menu rankings. As stated by ROTH, *it should be understood that the present invention can be used to arrange any menu of user-selectable items regardless of the medium that is used to present the menu* (column 5, lines 30-38, column 5, lines 46-59, column 6, lines 31-42). This is beneficial in that it allows for various sorting techniques in any menu environment of user-selectable items.

Regarding claim 18 and 27, see the rejections of the parent claims concerning the subject matter these claims are dependant upon. The combination of QU, KRAFT, and ROTH further discloses wherein the processor sorts said consolidated event list based on usage statistics associated with said events items on said consolidated event list (ROTH - column 13, line 21-column 14, line 33).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

MOON et al (US 6,385,662) – Processing information using a personal communication assistant

SMITH et al (US 6,333,973) – Integrated message center

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ARIEL BALAOING whose telephone number is (571)272-7317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, V. Paul Harper can be reached on (571) 272-7605. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VINCENT P. HARPER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Ariel Balaoing/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/A. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2617